

Amendment to the Drawing Figures:

The attached drawing sheet include proposed changes to FIG. 1 and replaces the original sheet including FIG. 1.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet

REMARKS / DISCUSSION OF ISSUES

Claims 1-10 are pending in the application. The claims in general are amended for one or more non-statutory reasons, for example to correct one or more informalities or obvious errors, remove figure label number(s), remove unnecessary limitations, and/or replace European claim phraseology with U.S. claim language having the same meaning. The claims are not narrowed in scope and no new matter is added. Entry after final action is proper because the scope of the claims is not changed and no further searching is required.

The final Office action rejects claims 5 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. §112, ¶1. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection, because those having ordinary skill in the art can generally determine, without any undue experimentation, a location wherein the region of lowest temperature establishes itself at the outer contour of the burner wall based on the known principles of pyrometry. Furthermore, those having ordinary skill in the art will specifically know a region of lowest temperature at the outer contour of the burner wall will be the lowest point of the outer contour of the burner wall in the midpoint of the electrodes, such as, for example, a region 30 of the outer contour of a burner wall 25 in the midpoint of electrodes 41 and 42. Accordingly, withdrawal of the §112, ¶1 rejection of claims 5 and 6 is respectfully requested.

The final Office action further rejects claims 5 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. §112, ¶2. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection, because those having ordinary skill in the art will be able to definitively determine the location of the region of the lowest temperature at the outer contour of the burner wall during the operation of the lamp and in dependence of the mounting position of the lamp as recited in independent claim 1. Accordingly, withdrawal of the §112, ¶2 rejection of claims 5 and 6 is respectfully requested.

The final Office action rejects claims 1, 2 and 5-10 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over U.S. Patent No. 5,952,768 to *Strok* et al. Applicant(s) respectfully traverse(s) this rejection. Claims 1, 2 and 5-10 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over the cited reference at least because *Strok* fails to teach or suggest an interference filter reflecting towards the discharge chamber mainly light in a wavelength range of infrared light wherein the material of the burner wall has its maximum emissive power and the material of the burner wall is not transparent to the infrared light as recited in independent claim 1, and therefore also in claims 2 and 5-10 which depend, directly or indirectly, from independent claim 1.

As to the traversal, Applicant respectfully asserts that a careful review of *Strok* reveals the fact that *Strok* teaches an interference filter 58 as shown in FIG. 2 of *Strok* that reflects towards a discharge chamber 34 mainly light in a wavelength range of infrared light wherein the maximum emissive power of a material of a burner wall 26 is not taken into consideration and the material of the burner wall 26 is transparent to the infrared light whereby the infrared light reflected by the interference filter 58 is reflected to an arc discharge region 36. See, Strok at column 4, lines 57 to column 5, line 35. Accordingly, withdrawal of the §102(b) rejection of claims 1, 2 and 5-10 is respectfully requested.

The final Office action also rejects claim 3 and 4 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as over U.S. Patent No. 5,952,768 to *Strok* et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,652,789 to *Kawakatsu* et al. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. Claims 3 and 4 are patentable over the cited references at least because they depend, directly or indirectly, from independent claim 1 which is patentable under the statute as explained above. Accordingly, withdrawal of the §103(a) rejection of claims 3 and 4 is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, applicant(s) respectfully request(s) that the Examiner withdraw the objection(s) and/or rejection(s) of record, allow all the pending claims, and find the application to be in condition for allowance. If any points remain in issue that may best be resolved through a personal or telephonic interview, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Darrin Wesley Harris/

Darrin Wesley Harris
Reg. 40,636
Atty' for Applicant(s)
Philips Intellectual Property
& Standards

P.O. Box 3001
Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510-8001
Phone: (914) 333-9635
Fax: (914) 332-0615